



special
collections
DOUGLAS
Library



QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY
AT KINGSTON

KINGSTON ONTARIO CANADA

sp

co

Do

Lil

qu

AT

kin

THE REAL
CHARACTER AND TENDENCY
OF THE
PROPOSED
REFORM.

“In political speculation the hazard of error is immense,
“and the result of the best formed scheme often different
“from that which has been anticipated. But for this very
“reason I cannot agree to the wholesale plans of Reform
“that are laid before us.”—*Lord John Russell.*

FOURTH EDITION.

LONDON:
PUBLISHED BY ROAKE & VARTY, 31 STRAND.

Price One Penny.

R. Clay, Printer, Bread-Sweet-Hill.

THE REAL TENDENCY

OF THE PROPOSED

REFORM.

THE moment has actually arrived when we find the Government of the country leagued, as it were, with her bitterest enemies, in a wild project for the unquestionable overthrow of the CONSTITUTION. The moment, therefore, has arrived, when silence upon the subject would nearly amount to guilt, and when the most urgent principle—that of self-preservation—calls upon the PEOPLE to make a stand, by remonstrance and declaration, against the removal of those landmarks which were erected by our ancestors, and the annihilation of those privileges and immunities which are, or ought to be, the inalienable right of every Englishman.

We beg, in the outset, to state, that we do not oppose A REFORM WHICH WOULD BE A REAL AMENDMENT OF ABUSES IN THE REPRESENTATIVE SYSTEM.

We are not desirous of imputing motives,—we have no wish to charge the projectors of the scheme of Reform which has been developed to parliament and the nation, through the medium of Lord John Russell, with any undue desire of raising their characters for patriotism on the ruins of the Government;—nor do we wish to attribute to them any desire to embarrass their successors in office, by exciting the expectations of the discontented to such a pitch, that no rational or

feasible scheme of increasing the number of Representatives proportionably to the general increase of the population, or otherwise improving the constitution of the House of Commons, would, at any future period, content or satisfy them. But of this we are convinced ;—let the motives which have led to its formation and promulgation be what they may; be they the purest that ever animated the heart of man, or the blackest that ever sullied the pages of our history, — the result is inevitable—no play upon words, no disguise, no qualification, will suffice to alter it,—THE REFORM means REVOLUTION. And if ever there could have been a doubt upon the subject, the fact that, with all the romantic and impracticable propositions of the present scheme, (and which, if carried into effect, must entirely subvert the government, and overthrow the three estates of the kingdom,)—the REFORMERS are not satisfied, is, we should think, quite sufficient to dissipate it. Mr. HUNT in parliament declares this fact, and at the moment when every rational sober-minded man of either party, Whig or Tory, is raising his hands and eyes to heaven in amazement at the audacity and danger of the project, Mr. HUNT recommends the REFORMERS to be contented with it *only as the stepping stone to something else.*

The scheme of Reform, as put forth by LORD JOHN RUSSELL, is now familiar to every body. Its principle is absurd, as well as perilous,—its operation impracticable, or if practicable, useless,—and its whole tendency, as we have already said, destructive to the constitution of the country.

The principle is absurd,—because it sets out with reducing the number of Representatives by way of increasing the efficiency of the representation. Its operation is impracticable,—because the regulation of voters, on the 1st of December

annually, can be no guide whatever either to their place of residence or their qualifications on the 1st of January, at which period the man registered on the roll as a voter for the *whole year*, may have sold or let his qualification in the parish where he was registered, and removed to another where he cannot be registered because he is too late to get his name inserted on the roll. And at the place where he was registered as a voter, he cannot vote, because he has ceased to be a resident.

But we will not descend to the details of this Quixotic measure: we will merely confine ourselves to exhibiting the effects producible by its enactment,—and the advantages derived by France from the last *glorious* effort of the Reformers there; and by showing the recorded opinions of the best authorities living and dead, upon the subject, endeavour to open the eyes of those, who, from a desire for ease and tranquillity, are willing to take things as they come, and give credit to assertions rather than take the trouble to sift and analyze them.

In the first place it is necessary to observe, that not one of the advocates for Lord John Russell's measure has ventured even to hint at what any of them expect will be the probable advantages derivable from its success to KING, LORDS, or COMMONS. As far as its history is developed, to the Commons it will be, under any circumstances, disadvantageous, for it reduces their number by sixty; and it must be evident to any body, who admits the power of a minority to induce a parliament to commit the suicidal act of its own dismemberment and reduction, that the same power and authority exist in that minority, at some future period, and at no very remote one, to dispense with the House of Peers, either in part or altogether, as appears "*convenient*"—for that seems to be the word—to the Cabinet.

We are told, as grounds for depriving sixty Boroughs of rights and privileges secured to them by charter and the law of the land, that charters are but pieces of parchment with bits of wax hanging to them, and that they are obsolete, and that times have changed, and circumstances have changed, and that therefore *it is convenient* to rob those places of their privileges. Does not this principle, if acted upon, afford a very strong precedent for demolishing the House of Lords? What are the patents of Peers but pieces of parchment with pieces of wax hanging to them? Whence are they derived?—From the Crown.—So are the charters. And as for the RIGHT being affected by change of circumstances, such a plea might with much greater plausibility thin the House of Lords to a very considerable extent. For instance—the DUKE of RICHMOND'S patent was granted by the Crown, because the person elevated to the Dukedom was the KING'S natural son. Circumstances are changed;—that claim of proximity is now obsolete, and the present DUKE of RICHMOND is only Duke of Richmond, because Charles II. gave his ancestor a piece of parchment, with a bit of wax hanging to it. The DUKE of MARLBOROUGH'S parchment and wax were granted for good and sufficient reasons to his illustrious progenitor. By the principle of Lord John's measure, the present Duke, being neither a hero nor a sage, is of course liable, from change of circumstances, to lose his patent, or charter. Of similar instances we could cite a hundred, and yet no man has dared to propose the extinction of those peerages whose present representatives are totally of a different character from the first possessor, and as much degenerated from the first stock, as the Winchilsea of William the Fourth's day, when it returned as its representative the head of all the Reformers—because

no other place would—Mr. HENRY, now LORD BROUGHAM, is from the Winchilsea of Edward the Third's time, when it was incorporated.

As to the right of meddling with close, or what the Reformers call Rotten Boroughs, the recorded opinions upon that subject are pretty strong; and by way of shewing that the authority upon which we speak is not to be treated lightly or disrespectfully, even by the most liberal men of these liberal days, we shall take the freedom of quoting the following passage from the works of that uncompromising reformer JUNIUS!!!

He says, "As to cutting away the Rotten Boroughs, I am as much offended as any man, at seeing so many of them under the direct influence of the crown, or at the disposal of private persons; yet I own that I have both doubts and apprehensions in regard to the remedy you propose. I shall be charged, perhaps, with an unusual want of political intrepidity, when I HONESTLY CONFESS THAT I AM STARTLED AT THE IDEA OF SO EXTENSIVE AN AMPUTATION. In the first place, I QUESTION THE POWER *de jure*, of the legislature to *disfranchise* a number of boroughs upon the *general ground* of improving the Constitution. I CONSIDER IT AS EQUIVALENT TO ROBBING the PARTIES CONCERNED OF THEIR FREEHOLD—of THEIR BIRTH-RIGHT! I say that, although this birth-right may *be forfeited*, or *the exercise of it suspended in particular cases*, it CANNOT BE TAKEN AWAY BY A GENERAL LAW FOR ANY REAL OR PRETENDED purpose of improving the Constitution."

This is the opinion of JUNIUS—the bold, daring, unflinching, hidden JUNIUS—"the shadow of whose name," as Mr. CANNING eloquently said, "is inseparably connected in our minds with an ardent, if not intemperate zeal in the cause of political freedom;" and, it must be confessed, it

is pretty clear evidence of his feelings as to this particular part of the question.

Now let us hear Mr. FOX—(also no mean authority upon the subject, seeing that he went the whole length with the Friends of the People, a society of which the present Earl GREY was the chairman—a circumstance which, to do his Lordship justice, he now regrets, and would rather not hear mentioned.) Mr. CHARLES FOX said, in 1781,—

“The honourable gentleman is pleased to say that the voice of this house is not the voice of the people, and *sets the language of clamour without doors in opposition to our deliberations*, as if we were not particularly appointed by the Constitution, the only revealers of the national mind, the only judges of what ought to be the sentiments of the kingdom; I say, what *ought to be*, because many laws are highly necessary for the public safety, *which excite the discontent of the people*.

“If we were never to pass a law till it obtained the sanction of popular approbation, we should never have a settled revenue, to support either the establishment of our domestic policy, or to defend us against the invasions of a foreign enemy. *The uninformed zealots, who SEEM animated* with an enthusiastic love for their country, generally charge us with having sold them to a minister; and we are accused of venality for imposing burdens which we know to be absolutely necessary, and to which we ourselves, as the House of Commons is supposed an assembly of the first property in the state, must always be the largest contributors.”

“We are chosen,” continued Mr. Fox, “the delegates of the British electors, for salutary, not pernicious purposes—to guard, not to invade the constitution; *to keep the privileges of the freemen we represent, as much within their proper limits,*

as to control any *unwarrantable exertion of the regal authority*. We are bound to promote their *true interests*, in preference to *the dearest desires of their hearts*; and the constitution makes us the sole arbiters of those interests, notwithstanding the *imaginary* infallibility of the *people*."

"Shall we," asks Mr. Fox, "sacrifice our reason, our honour, our conscience, to THE FEAR of INCURRING THE POPULAR RESENTMENT? and while we are appointed to watch the Hesperian fruit of liberty with a dragon's eye, be ourselves the only slaves of the whole community?"

"Perhaps the honourable gentleman will tell me, that nothing but the soul of absurdity could suspect the people of a design against their own happiness. Sir, I do not suspect the people of any such design, but I suspect their capacity to judge of their own happiness. I KNOW THEY ARE GENERALLY CREDULOUS, AND GENERALLY UNINFORMED — captivated by appearances, while they neglect the most important essentials, and ALWAYS RIDICULOUSLY READY TO BELIEVE, THAT THOSE MEN WHO HAVE THE GREATEST REASON, FROM THEIR EXTENSIVE PROPERTY, TO BE ANXIOUS FOR THE PUBLIC SAFETY, ARE ALWAYS CONCERTING MEASURES FOR THE OPPRESSION OF THEIR OWN POSTERITY.

"I stand up for the CONSTITUTION, not for the PEOPLE. *If the People attempt to invade the Constitution*, they are the ENEMIES OF THE NATION. Being therefore convinced that we are to do justice, whether it is agreeable or disagreeable, I am for maintaining *the independency of Parliament*, and will not be a REBEL to my KING, to my country, or my own heart, for the loudest huzza of an *inconsiderate multitude*."

These, Reader, are the sentiments of that CHARLES JAMES FOX, whose name has been, and

will continue to be handed down as one of the most uncompromising Whigs in England, and of course one of the real friends of the people.

The opinions of Mr. CANNING, so powerfully embodied in his brilliant speeches, are so fresh upon the memories of men, that it would, perhaps, in this part of our appeal, be useless to recall them; but we cannot resist the temptation of placing before our readers a still more recent declaration of a yet living patriot—no other than LORD JOHN RUSSELL himself, the mouth-piece of the ministry upon the present occasion—the patron, the protector, the producer of their notable scheme.

“The question is, Why not disfranchise the unconvicted boroughs? To this I answer, that I do not by any means maintain that the resolutions I now propose comprise all the amendments that can be made, in the frame of this house. Whenever a specific proposition is made, I shall be ready to give it all my attention, and if I can approve of it, to adopt it. But I do not at present, I confess, see any rule by which any unconvicted boroughs can be disfranchised, without disfranchising the whole. We then arrive at what is called a Reform upon the principle of the reconstruction of the entire House of Commons. Now, Sir, I will not dwell upon the arguments which are generally used to repel such a proposition; arguments resting chiefly upon the advantage of admitting men of talent into this house, by means of the close boroughs; and on the danger that an assembly of popular delegates would overthrow the two other branches of the Legislature. *But I cannot forget that these arguments have been urged, not, as some out of doors endeavour to persuade the people, by borough-mongers anxious to defend their own vile interests, but by some of the greatest, the brightest, and*

the most virtuous men this country ever produced. I cannot say, however, that I give entire credit to these arguments, because I think that in POLITICAL SPECULATION THE HAZARD OF ERROR IS IMMENSE, AND THE RESULT OF THE BEST FORMED SCHEME OFTEN DIFFERENT FROM THAT WHICH HAS BEEN ANTICIPATED. But for this very reason I CANNOT AGREE TO THE WHOLESALE PLANS OF REFORM THAT ARE LAID BEFORE US. We have no experience to guide us in the alterations which are proposed, at least none that is encouraging. There is, indeed, the example of Spain. Spain was formerly in the enjoyment of a free Constitution; but in the course of the fifteenth century many of the towns fell into the hands of the nobility, who, instead of influencing the elections of members of Cortes (the practice so much reprobated in this house) prevented their sending members at all. The consequence was, that when a struggle took place between the King and the Cortes, the aristocracy, feeling no common interest with the representative body, joined the Crown, and destroyed for ever the liberties of their country. There is also the example of the present French Constitution, but that is of too recent a date, not to say of too precarious a nature, to make a rule for us to go by: we must come back then to our own laws. The Constitution of this country is not written down like that of some of our neighbours. I know not where to look for it, except in the division into King, Lords, and Commons, and in the composition of this house, which has long been the supreme body in the state.

"The composition of this house by representatives of counties, cities, and boroughs, I take to be an intimate part of our Constitution. The house was so formed when they passed the Habeas

Corpus Act; a law which, together with other wise laws, Mr. Cobbett himself desires to preserve, although, with strange inconsistency, while he cherishes the fruit he would cut down the tree. This house was constituted on the same principle of counties, cities, and boroughs, when Montesquieu pronounced it to be the most perfect in the world. *Old Sarum existed when Somers, and the great men of the Revolution, established our government.* Rutland sent as many members as Yorkshire, when Hampden lost his life in defence of the Constitution. Are we, then, to conclude that Montesquieu praised a corrupt oligarchy?—that Somers, and the great men of that day, expelled a king in order to set up a many-headed tyranny?—that Hampden sacrificed his life for the interests of a boroughmongering faction? No! the principles of the construction of this House ARE PURE AND WORTHY. If we should endeavour to change them altogether, we should commit the folly of the servant in the story of ‘Aladdin,’ who is deceived by the cry of ‘New lamps for old.’ Our lamp is covered with dirt and rubbish, but it has a magical power. It has raised up a smiling land, not bestrode with overgrown palaces, but covered with quickset dwellings, every one of which holds a freeman, enjoying equal privileges with the proudest subject in the land. It has called into life all the busy creations of commercial prosperity. Nor, when men were wanting to illustrate and defend their country, have such men been deficient. When the fate of the nation depended on the line of policy she should adopt, there were orators of the highest degree, placing in the strongest light the argument for peace or war. When we were engaged in war, we had warriors ready to gain us laurels in the field, or to wield our thunders on the sea. When, again, we returned to peace, the question

of internal policy, of education of the poor, and of criminal law, found men ready to devote the most splendid abilities to the welfare of the most indigent class of the community! And, Sir, shall we change an instrument which has produced effects so wonderful for a burnished and tinsel article of modern manufacture? *No! small as the remaining treasure of the Constitution is, I cannot consent to throw it into the wheel for the chance of obtaining a prize in the Lottery of Constitutions.*"

If anything were wanting to show the real character of the present hubbub about Reform, this beautiful glowing picture of the prosperity derived to England from her ancient institutions, painted by LORD JOHN RUSSELL himself, would surely be amply sufficient.—Had not SIR ROBERT PEEL, in his admirable speech the other night in the House of Commons, quoted this speech of LORD JOHN, upon LORD JOHN himself, then and there standing opposite to him, it really would be incredible.

But there remains to be noticed a perhaps better advocate than LORD JOHN RUSSELL, — one WILLIAM COBBETT, now the violent advocate of this Reform scheme;—let us just for a moment see what his opinions have been upon the subject. And we look at them with considerable interest, because we shall presently take occasion to prove, not so much that those opinions as to Reform are changed, but that his present espousal of the cause is, as he considers, essential to bringing about the consequences of which he formerly expressed the most sensitive alarm, and the most unqualified detestation.

Cobbett says, in his Register, vol. i. p. 116, that "the bulk of political Reformers is always composed of needy, discontented men, too indolent or impatient to advance themselves by fair and

honest means, and too ambitious to rest quiet in obscurity.”—“The same visionary delusion,” he continues, p. 169, “seems to have pervaded *all Reformers in all ages*; they do not consider what *can* be done, but what *they think* ought to be done; they have no calculating principle to discover whether a Reform WILL COST THEM MORE THAN IT IS WORTH, OR NOT! They do not sit down to count the cost; but the object being, as they *think*, desirable, *the means are totally disregarded*. If the FIRST FRENCH REFORMERS had counted the cost, I do not think they were VILLAINS or IDIOTS enough to have pursued their plan *as they did*: do these people calculate? Certainly not; they will not take man as they find him, and govern him upon principles established by experience; they will have him to be a “faultless monster that the world ne’er saw,” and wish to govern him according to a system *that never was, and never can be, brought into practice*.”

“The waking dreams of the REFORMERS,” continues COBBETT, “would be of no more consequence than those of the night, were they not generally pursued with an unjustifiable degree of OBSTINACY and INTRIGUE, and even VILLAINY; and did they not, being always *adapted to flatter and inflame the lower orders of the people*, often baffle every effort of legal power. Thus it happened in England, in *the reign of CHARLES THE FIRST, and thus it has been ever since*.”

“That a PARLIAMENTARY REFORM,” continues COBBETT, “was the handle by which the English REVOLUTIONISTS intended to effect the *destruction of the Constitution*, needs not to be insisted on. Is it not notorious that CHANGING the form of government, and destroying the distinctions in society, have introduced all the troubles in Europe? HAD THE FORM OF GOVERNMENT

IN FRANCE CONTINUED what it had been for twelve or thirteen hundred years, would their TROUBLES *ever have existed?* To hazard an assertion like this, a man *must be an idiot*, or he *must think his readers so.*"

Here we have Mr. COBBETT'S written, printed, and published opinions upon Reform, and the troubles which overran France, consequent upon *the alteration in the form of her government*, and the *destruction of distinctions in society*. On the 22d of February, 1831, in this present year, a few days ago, he in fact says this:

"Why is France TROUBLED, tormented, and convulsed in this manner? Because there is a PRETENDER to the throne of France; and why is there a pretender to the throne of France? Because there IS A THRONE for him to have pretension to; *and as long as that throne shall exist* there will be always some despicable creature or other, some dotard, some driveller, some half-idiot, some child, or something or another, to agitate, convulse, set together by the ears, and render miserable that great nation; there always being a numerous crew ready to shed a people's blood, or to cause them to shed each other's blood, rather than forego the desire to live upon the fruit of their labours. If the Americans had made *a throne*, if they had been fools enough to do that! if they had been such ridiculous asses as to erect a throne and create a royal family, they would never have known anything of freedom any more from that hour."

"There is," adds Mr. COBBETT, "no remedy but that of repealing the law that made the present throne. Common sense says that it *ought to be done, and done it will be*. There will be a REPUBLICAN government, a system efficient and cheap."

While giving Mr. Cobbett's *present* views of

the results of REFORM, it is impossible to resist the temptation of quoting his own words of a remoter date, when he says, "In the days of youth and of ignorance, I was led to believe that comfort, freedom, and virtue, were exclusively the lot of REPUBLICANS. *A very short trial convinced me of my error, admonished me to repent of my folly, and urged me to compensate for the injustice of the opinions I had conceived.*"

"Once more under the safeguard of that Sovereign who watched over me in my infancy, I feel an irresistible desire to communicate to my countrymen the fruit of my experience, to show them the *injurious and degrading consequences* of DISCONTENTMENT, DISLOYALTY, and INNOVATION, to convince them that they are the freest as well as happiest of the human race; and, above *all*, to warn them against the arts of those ambitious and PERFIDIOUS DEMAGOGUES, who would willingly reduce them to a level with the *cheated slaves*, in the bearing of whose yoke I have had the mortification to share."

Here we at once see the opinions of Mr. COBBETT on political Reform, and its inseparable companion, Revolution, at two different periods. But it is neither to exhibit his flagrant tergiversation, nor its consequent base profligacy, that we bring forward this conflicting, yet convicting testimony against him; it is not to throw the declarations and opinions of LORD JOHN RUSSELL in one session of parliament, in the teeth of LORD JOHN RUSSELL in another session of parliament, that we submit the extract above quoted from his speech; but it is to show that all these men—all the advocates, or pretended advocates, for Reform, let their present declared opinions be what they may—are as fully aware as we are, that PARLIAMENTARY REFORM like LORD JOHN

RUSSELL'S, and REVOLUTION, ARE SYNONYMOUS.

But we have other, and we will unhesitatingly add, higher authorities than those we have already noticed, to which we now beg to call the attention of the reader.

Amongst the most important names arrayed against the principle of Parliamentary Reform, highly exalted, stands that of Mr. CANNING.

"For my part," said that illustrious statesman, "I value the system of parliamentary representation, for that very want of uniformity which is complained of in the petition, and for the variety of rights of election. *I conceive to establish one uniform right, would inevitably be to exclude some important interests from the advantage of being represented in this House.*"

"Persons," continued Mr. Canning, "may look with a critical and microscopic eye into bodies physical or moral, until doubts arise whether it is possible for them to perform their assigned functions. Man himself is said, by inspired authority, to be fearfully as well as wonderfully made;—the study of anatomy, while it leads to the most beneficial discoveries for the detection and cure of physical disease, has yet a tendency in some minds rather to degrade than exalt the opinion of human nature. It appears surprising to the contemplator of a skeleton of the human form, that the eyeless scull, the sapless bones, the assemblage of sinews and cartilages, in which intellect and volition have ceased to reside; that this piece of mechanism should constitute a creature so noble in reason, so infinite in faculties and apprehension, so like a God,—a creature formed after the image of the Divinity, to whom Providence

Os—sublime dedit : cælumque tueri
Jussit, et erectos ad sidera tollere vultus.

“So, in considering too curiously the composition of the House, and the different processes through which it is composed, not those processes alone which are emphatically considered as pollution and corruption, but those also which rank among the noblest exercises of personal freedom, the canvasses, the conflicts, the controversies, and (what is inseparable from them) the vituperations and excesses of popular elections; a dissector of political constitutions might well be surprised to behold the product of such elements in an assembly, of which, whatever may be its other characteristics, no man will seriously deny that it comprehends as much of intellectual ability, and of moral integrity, as was ever brought together in the civilized world. Nay, to an unlearned spectator, undertaking, for the first time, an anatomical examination of the House of Commons, those parts of it which, according to theory, are its beauties, must appear most particularly its stains; for while the members returned for burghage-tenure seats, or through other obscure and noiseless modes of election, pass into the House of Commons unnoticed and uncriticised, their talents unquestioned, and their reputation unassailed, the successful candidate comes there loaded with the imputation of every vice and crime that could unfit a man, not only for representing any class of persons, but for mixing with them as a member of society.

“The first effect of a Reform which should convert all elections into popular ones, would probably be to insure a congregation of individuals, against every one of whom a respectable minority of his constituents would have pronounced sentence of condemnation. And if it be so very hard, that there are now a great number of persons who do not directly exercise the elective franchise, and who are therefore represented by persons whom

others have chosen for them, would this matter be much mended when two-fifths of the people of England should be represented, not only without their choice, but *against their will*, — not only by the individuals whom they had not selected, but by those whom they had declared utterly unworthy of their confidence?"

Mr. CANNING proceeds thus:— "Dreading, therefore, the danger of total, and seeing the difficulties as well as the unprofitableness of partial alteration, *I object to this first step towards a change in the constitution of the House of Commons.—There are wild theories abroad.* I am not disposed to impute an ill motive to any man who entertains them. I will believe such a man to be as sincere in his conviction of the possibility of realizing his notions of change, without risking the tranquillity of the country, as I am sincere in my BELIEF OF THEIR IMPRACTICABILITY, AND OF THE TREMENDOUS DANGER OF ATTEMPTING TO CARRY THEM INTO EFFECT. But, for the sake of the world, as well as for our own safety, LET US BE CAUTIOUS and FIRM. Other nations, excited by the example of the liberty which this country has long possessed, have attempted to copy our Constitution; and some of them have shot beyond it, in the fierceness of their pursuit. I grudge not to other nations that share of liberty which they may acquire: in the name of GOD, let them enjoy it; but, let us warn them that they lose not the object of their desires, by the very eagerness with which they attempt to grasp it. INHERITORS and CONSERVATORS of rational freedom, let us, while others are seeking it, in restlessness and trouble, be a steady and shining light to guide their course; not a wandering meteor to bewilder and mislead them.

"Let it not be thought that this is an unfriendly or disheartening counsel to those who are either

struggling under the pressure of harsh governments, or *exulting* in the novelty of sudden emancipation. It is addressed much rather to those who, cradled and educated amidst the sober blessings of the British Constitution, PANT FOR OTHER SCHEMES OF LIBERTY THAN THOSE WHICH THAT CONSTITUTION SANCTIONS—other than are compatible with a JUST EQUALITY OF CIVIL RIGHTS, or with the NECESSARY RESTRAINTS OF SOCIAL OBLIGATIONS. Of some of whom it may be said, in the language which Dryden puts into the mouth of one of the most extravagant of his heroes—

‘ They would be free as nature first made man,
Ere the base laws of servitude began ;
When, wild in woods, the noble savage ran.’

Noble and swelling sentiments!—BUT SUCH AS CANNOT BE REDUCED INTO PRACTICE. Grand ideas!—but which must be qualified and adjusted by a compromise between the aspirings of individuals and a due concern for the general tranquillity—must be subdued, and chastened by reason and experience, before they can be directed to any useful end.

“A search after abstract perfection in Governments may produce, in generous minds, an enterprise and enthusiasm to be recorded by the historian, and to be celebrated by the poet; but such perfection is NOT AN OBJECT OF REASONABLE PURSUIT, BECAUSE IT IS NOT ONE OF POSSIBLE ATTAINMENT; AND NEVER YET DID A PASSIONATE STRUGGLE AFTER AN ABSOLUTELY UNATTAINABLE OBJECT, FAIL TO BE PRODUCTIVE OF MISERY TO AN INDIVIDUAL—OF MADNESS AND CONFUSION TO A PEOPLE.

“Our lot,” continues Mr. Canning, “is happily cast in the temperate zone of freedom, the clime best suited to the development of the moral

qualities of the human race—to the cultivation of their faculties, and to the security, as well as the improvement of their virtues—a clime, not exempt indeed from variations of the elements, but variations which purify while they agitate the atmosphere that we breathe. LET US BE SENSIBLE OF THE ADVANTAGES WHICH IT IS OUR HAPPINESS TO ENJOY. LET US GUARD, WITH PIOUS GRATITUDE, THE FLAME OF GENUINE LIBERTY, THAT FIRE FROM HEAVEN, OF WHICH OUR CONSTITUTION IS THE HOLY DEPOSITORY; AND LET US NOT, FOR THE CHANCE OF RENDERING IT MORE INTENSE AND MORE RADIANT, IMPAIR ITS PURITY, OR HAZARD ITS EXTINCTION."

Here we have the declared, avowed opinions of Mr. CANNING, the most *liberal* minister England perhaps ever had, upon this question, delivered upon the occasion of another motion of Lord JOHN RUSSELL'S, mild, to mere mawkishness, compared with the extravagant project now brought forward.

It may perhaps not be amiss, at this point of our review of opinions, to explain what appears to be a generally received mistake with respect to Mr. PITT'S feelings about Reform. COBBETT says, that Mr. PITT was a Reformer when he was young and inexperienced, but that time and age shewed *him his mistake*; however, when Mr. PITT was a Reformer, he never entertained such wild and absurd notions as those now broached.

MR. PITT'S Reform plan was to add a hundred members to the House of Commons, which, to say truth, appears to be rather a more rational mode of increasing the efficiency of the representation, *than taking away sixty-two*; but this addition was to be made without venturing to touch any existing right of election. MR. PITT proposed to establish a fund of one million for the

purpose of purchasing the elective franchise from such decayed Boroughs *as might be disposed to sell*. This fund was to accumulate at compound interest till an adequate inducement was provided for the *voluntary surrender* by the proprietor of such elective franchise as it might be thought expedient to abolish. We are not prepared to say, that an alteration of this kind would be advisable; but the reader will please to bear in mind, that Mr. PITT never lost sight of the obligation to preserve as well as amend, or, to use Mr. CANNING's words, "that he proposed not to enforce any reluctant surrender, nor to sacrifice any other than voluntary victims, on the altar of practical improvement."

But to return. We have not only the evidence of those persons whom we have already named in opposition to the present Ministerial Reform measure; we have not only CANNING, Fox, COBBETT, and LORD JOHN RUSSELL himself,—we have LORD MELBOURNE, one of its present advocates, and one of the present cabinet. That noble Lord said that he was of opinion, that the alteration proposed would trench extremely on the MONARCHICAL CONSTITUTION. He would not stop to argue whether the balance of democracy were too little or too great in the Constitution; but he would DISTINCTLY and DECISIVELY DECLARE, that while he did nothing to diminish it, he certainly would do nothing to increase it—in HIS OPINION, THE ADVANTAGES WERE ALREADY ON THE SIDE OF THE PEOPLE." This, Reader, was the decisive declaration of the *present cabinet minister*, LORD MELBOURNE, then the Honourable W. Lamb, five years since.

The next testimony we have to offer against the Reform measure is that of SIR JAMES MACKINTOSH, who, if not a minister, holds ministerial office as one of the paid Members of the Board of

Controul, *which office he has himself voted useless*, and who, besides, enjoys two pensions from the East India Company, amounting to one thousand five hundred pounds a-year; the last having been granted to him seven years before he accepted efficient office in the present Government, *because his age and infirmities incapacitated him from lecturing the boys at Hayleybury College.*

This SIR JAMES MACKINTOSH, a first-rate authority, and moreover representative of the DUKE OF DEVONSHIRE'S borough of Knaresborough, he—this pensioned patriot—this rotten-borough Reformer, says,

“The best security which human wisdom can devise seems to be, the distribution of political authority among different individuals and bodies, with separate interests and separate characters, corresponding to the variety of classes of which civil society is composed,—each calculated to guard their own order from oppression by the rest,—each also interested to prevent any of the others from seizing on exclusive, and therefore despotic, power; and all having a common interest to cooperate in carrying on the ordinary and necessary administration of Government.”

“By the Constitution of a State,” says SIR JAMES, “I mean the body of those written and unwritten fundamental laws which regulate the most important rights of the higher magistrates, and the most essential privileges of the subject. Such a body of political laws must, in all countries, arise out of the character and situation of a people; they must grow with its progress, be adapted to its peculiarities, change with its changes, and be incorporated into its habits. Human wisdom cannot form such a Constitution by one act; for human wisdom cannot create the materials of which it is composed. *The attempt, always ineffectual, to change by violence the ancient habits*

of men, and the established order of society, so as to fit them absolutely for a new scheme of Government, flows from the MOST PRESUMPTUOUS IGNORANCE, REQUIRES THE SUPPORT OF THE MOST FEROCIOUS TYRANNY, AND LEADS TO CONSEQUENCES WHICH ITS AUTHORS CAN NEVER FORESEE; GENERALLY, INDEED, TO INSTITUTIONS THE MOST OPPOSITE TO THOSE OF WHICH THEY PROFESS TO SEEK THE ESTABLISHMENT!"

"Philosophers of great and merited reputation have told us that the English Constitution consisted of certain portions of monarchy, aristocracy, and democracy; names which are, in truth, very little applicable, and which, if they were, would as little give an idea of this Government, as an account of the weight of bone, of flesh, and of blood in a human body would be a picture of a living being."

"I shall labour," continues Sir JAMES, "above all things, to avoid that which appears to me to have been the *constant source of political error!* I mean the attempt to give an air of system, of simplicity, and of rigorous demonstration, to subjects which do not admit it. The only means by which this could be done was by referring to a few simple causes, which, in truth, arose from immense and intricate combinations and successions of causes. The consequence was very obvious;—the system of the theorist, disencumbered from all regard to the *real nature of things*, easily assumed an air of speciousness. It required little dexterity to make his argument appear conclusive; but all men agreed *that it was utterly inapplicable to human affairs*. The theorist railed at the folly of the world, instead of confessing his own; and the man of practice unjustly blamed philosophy, instead of condemning the sophist. The causes which the politician has to consider are, above all others, multiplied, mutable, minute, subtile, and, if I may so speak, evanescent; perpetually changing their

form and varying their combinations ; losing their nature, while they keep their name ; exhibiting the most different consequences in the endless variety of men and nations on whom they operate,—in one degree of strength, producing the most signal benefit, and under a SLIGHT VARIATION OF CIRCUMSTANCES, THE MOST TREMENDOUS MISCHIEF.”

“ They admit, indeed,” says Sir JAMES, “ of being reduced to theory, but to a theory formed on the most extensive views, of the most comprehensive and flexible principles, to embrace all their varieties, and to fit all their rapid trans-migrations ; a theory, of which the most fundamental maxim is, DISTRUST IN ITSELF, AND DEFERENCE FOR PRACTICAL PRUDENCE.”

We have now quoted a few opinions upon the subject of *radical reform* which we think, able as they are, will lose none of their effect upon the reader, when he recollects that most of the authorities which we have cited are living, and not only living, but actually at this moment forming part of the very administration which is pressing forward the wild and destructive measure of radical reform. Having now shown those opinions,—opinions maturely considered and deliberately delivered, it becomes our duty to ascertain, if possible, one point which neither LORD JOHN RUSSELL, nor any of his colleagues or compeers, have yet ventured to touch—We mean the results,—the consequences of the success of the proposed measure,—the results and consequences, in fact, of the REVOLUTION to be produced by the passing of this most extraordinary bill : and here, in the absence of any new information upon the subject, we beg to quote two tolerably good authorities.

The first says, “ It was a *serious* and *melancholy* truth, that the ONLY RESULT of yielding to the *desire of conciliating popular favour*, by proposing measures which discretion did not approve,

was, that many would *be ready to outbid for that applause by still more extravagant concessions*; AND THE HIGHEST BIDDER WOULD NOT BE THE MOST 'HONEST AND ENLIGHTENED, BUT THE MOST SERVILE AND SUBMISSIVE,—THE MOST MAD OR DIS-HONEST."

The gentleman who made this pithy observation was Mr. HENRY BROUGHAM, the present LORD CHANCELLOR—he made it on the 2d of June, 1818.

In order further to illustrate the just view which these people of experience take of the scheme, we shall beg leave to cite *another* authority,—equally respectable and equally satisfactory, upon such subjects.

"The first step we want," says our new authority, "is an acknowledgment that some change is necessary and will be made. This would be, of itself, an important reform, and the *inevitable consequence* of the first step would be, I confidently believe, the attainment, in time, of *all we can desire*. Let us but introduce the fine end of the wedge, and trust to US for getting in the large end afterwards."

This is the view of the subject taken by Mr. JOHN CAM HOBBHOUSE, at present member for Westminster.

It seems then pretty clear, from all we have collected, that we were not very far from the truth when we set out by denouncing the projected REFORM as REVOLUTION. It is therefore perhaps necessary, before we conclude, to say a few words upon the Revolution, which, we are told, in the pot-house newspapers, has excited all the world to agitation—we mean, what are called the "Three Glorious Days of Paris," an appellation of which we never could perceive the justice. But this is not what we care about,—we want to ask, and to ascertain, admitting the three days to have been

the most glorious of all glorified days in the annals of Revolution and bloodshed, what advantage any one human individual in the whole kingdom of France has gained by the change?

The only very evident marks of advantage, which strike one forcibly, are the destruction of the Boulevards, one of the pretty peculiarities of their overgrown metropolis, and which got them a considerable quantity of English patronage, and a number of English customers; the total stagnation of their trade in laces, silks, and jewellery; the entire disappearance of British capital; the cessation of all gaiety and public amusements, which are essential to their existence; besides the loss of traffic, consequent upon the discontinuance of courtly assemblies; add to these minor alterations, the failure of the capitalists; the stoppage of bankers; the loss of credit, and the entire destruction of confidence; and you have some, among many, of the BLESSINGS of a Revolution.

But look deeper and nearer into it. A short time after the expulsion of Charles the Tenth, old LA FAYETTE became as unpopular as he was before popular. The Citizen KING, who degraded himself, by the advice of his *republican ministers*, to *APPEAR the advocate of a system which, in his heart, he must cordially have detested*, after having condescended to the most unworthy sacrifices, and let his overbearing leader, (grey as he is,) trample upon him, is now so much at a discount, that the chances are, he will be living at GRILLION'S Hotel, in Albemarle street, in a fortnight; GUIZOT, the popular minister, chased; DUPIN, the cleverest lawyer and demagogue that ever lived, in his way, threatened by the mob with hanging at the lamp post; while PERSIL volunteers a declaration, that the people are now more discontented than they were before the abdication of Charles.

Let any body read the newspapers, and see the accounts from wretched, revolutionized Paris; mobs parade the streets, crying for BREAD or WORK, or BLOOD, and the National Guards charge them, disperse them, and *tear their tri-coloured flag*; the palace of the Archbishop is plundered; the churches are desecrated, and the sacred emblem of religion is torn down and trampled under foot; the revenue fails, because commerce is at a stand, and at the same time the national expenditure is greatly augmented; because France must arm to support revolution every where; and this, and all the concomitant circumstances, are held up to us—to Englishmen, to admire and imitate. England, at peace with all the world, prosperous in her trade, active in her manufactures, rich in her stores, and teeming with the bounties of Providence, and the blessings of a mild and paternal government, is called upon to follow the example of a French mob, who were excited by the lurking agents of the Napoleon faction, to resist the operation of an *unconstitutional ordinance*. In England the case is reversed; THE REFORMERS are striving to carry unconstitutional measures — *they* are the INNOVATORS; and WE, who scorn their advances, and repel their alarming propositions, are the CONSERVATORS of the CONSTITUTION.

Look at America—look at the state of her Government. No man, no body of men, no part of the Legislature, of itself, there, dare touch a question involving the changing or unsettling the Constitution of the Union. The suggestion even of an alteration must not be made without a convention of all the States, and then with the greatest care and jealousy, is the smallest innovation allowed. Here, we have a single and not very important individual member of one of the estates of the realm, proposing, at “one fell swoop,” to alter the whole character of the representation; and if we murmur

at such an arbitrary and uncalled-for invasion of our rights, we are to be told, that the people, animated by the three *glorious!!!* days in Paris, will not be satisfied without Reform.

THIS IS NOT TRUE,—the excitement about Reform is fictitious, artificial; *promoted, if not excited by the Ministers themselves, or their busy adherents*, for the purpose of over-awing their opponents: and, (if they themselves fail of throwing us into confusion,) of covering their retreat from office on the true ground of incapacity and ignorance, by the showy pretext of a defeated zeal for the good of the PEOPLE.

But again to the point;—What would be the result of the success of the Reform measure, admitting it to succeed to its fullest extent? What man, woman, or child in the whole British Empire would be benefited in the slightest degree? Would the disfranchisement of *Gatton*, and *Salisbury*, and the representation of *Sheffield* and *Gateshead*, in Parliament, make corn cheaper, or beer better? Should we be able to travel by steam without taxation, because there was one man returned for Reigate, instead of two? Or should we pay no window tax, no house tax, no horse tax, or no tax at all, because Brighton gained a member and Sandwich lost one? Why the veriest idiot living must see the absurdity of the supposition—unless Reform be followed, as its advocates, by coupling with it the cry for Retrenchment in all their petitions. expect it inevitably will be, by the violation of the national faith, and the confiscation of the **FUNDS and CHURCH PROPERTY**.

Then as to the life interest in scot and lot voting: it is clear that the ultimate result of that part of the system will be, that a poor man will *never have a vote at all*; while by the new rates of qualification, many places which now have four or five hundred voters, will be reduced to having not more than one

hundred. To be sure, three members of the King's privy council may, in that case, go down, and of their own free will, admit, at their pleasure and discretion, any of the adjoining districts or chapelries to the elective privilege. But why should this be law? why am I, who, as one of an extensive corporation, have voted honestly and conscientiously for members of Parliament by a right inherent in me, guaranteed to me by the Constitution—why am I to be disfranchised, and why is a man, who can afford to pay ten pounds a year, for a house which perhaps I cannot, to have a privilege given him at my expense?

Then, again, of the forty-seven boroughs and towns which are to be deprived of one member each; upon what ground am I, as an honest elector, to be robbed of half my rights and privileges? Nobody can tell me: however, it is enough for me to know, that the principle of the bill, supposing all the rest to be legal and constitutional, is idiotic. Thus, my LORD RUSSELL proposes to *increase* the efficiency of the representation, *by taking away sixty-two members*, and intends to *extend* the privilege of voting, *by raising the qualification*: so that, as we have already said, a poor man, who before had nothing but his vote to make him contented, *will not now be able to vote at all*.

And may not the same principle, once admitted, lead to any other, even the most violent changes, and the entire destruction of the Constitution? But the effects of a Revolution in England it is needless to recount; utter ruin at home, and the most helpless dependence upon our enemies abroad, must be the immediate results—the destruction of trade, the loss of our colonies, the degradation of our national character, and the certain surrender of all our rights and immunities to the will and power of some sanguinary despot, who, more daring and desperate than his fellows, will follow the example which has been so frequently set, and, trampling

over the bleeding carcasses of the deluded victims of treason, attain the supremacy which he has affected to despise and condemn, when lawfully possessed by others.

This, Reader, is no idle vision, no vague anticipation; ITS TRUTH HAS BEEN PROVED. Did not the most arbitrary and tyrannical reign that France ever knew, follow the overthrow of the mild and diffident Louis XVI? After the expiation of the bloody crimes of ROBESPIERRE, and the unnatural treason of the King's brother, (the father of the present puppet monarch), on the scaffold, France, having suffered ills and difficulties which she never may recover, fell under the dominion of a foreign upstart, who, not contented with the mere title of KING, assumed the IMPERIAL DIGNITY, and who, after a series of defeats and disgraces, left France debased and degraded, the prey of all the other states of Europe, with Russian cossacks quartered in her metropolis, and English soldiers doing duty in her palaces.

To what did that country gladly and eagerly return? the mild sway of its once exiled KING. To what is it now again driven? to a second revolution, by the same bloody and murderous spirit, fermented by the same hoary republicans, grown veterans in their nefarious trade. Again the Monarch is exiled—again the throne is filled by an upstart—but the puppet is powerless; and the identical revolutionists, who placed him on the throne, have deprived him so completely of sovereign power, that he has become the laughing-stock, the May-game of his FELLOW-CITIZENS.

Again is Paris in agitation—again do crowds fill the air with their cries. The tradesmen's shops are shut; the public places are abandoned; the citizens, turned soldiers, are doomed to a life subservient to military law, and are constantly on duty, not more for the purpose of protecting the

dwindling property they themselves possess, than with the object of keeping each other under control, and away from civil combinations.

Is this the state of things that Englishmen are called upon to admire as a noble example?—Is the bloody insurrection of sans-culottes and fishwomen held up as matter of praise and glory? Are the riotings of half-witted schoolboys, or the murders committed by children of ten years of age, presented to us as objects worthy of imitation? Are the destruction of the Archbishop's palace—the abasement of the holy cross, and the elevation of the tri-coloured flag in its place, exhibited to us as enviable evidence of REFORM and LIBERALITY?

ENGLISHMEN BEWARE! The first step loses you. Reject the inflammatory appeals which are made to you under the most shameful circumstances, and in the most shameless manner. The KING's name is brought unconstitutionally to influence the people generally, and the House of Commons particularly.

But the SENSE OF THE COUNTRY IS NOT WITH THEM. The unconstitutional stratagems and tricks they have practised,—their vulgar association with creatures they despise, to carry their point, and extort a favourable answer from the SOVEREIGN— which answer, recollect, THEY WRITE THEMSELVES— the falsehoods uttered at the tavern meetings which they palliate, and the cunning meanness with which they have cut and carved their PANACEAN measure, so as to save their own influence and destroy that of their constitutional opponents,—these have opened the eyes of the PEOPLE.

The thirst for place which has put into office so many of the RELATIONS and CONNEXIONS of one man, that MAN being the head of the friends of the PEOPLE,—the bungling inefficiency of their measures,—their ignorance of all details of business,—

the falsification of facts to suit their purposes,—and their pertinacious adherence to theoretical schemes of political economy, threatening the extinction of our trade, and the loss of our colonies and commerce, have given us a fair specimen as to what THEY HAVE DONE, and hold out a fairer promise of what they WOULD DO, if they were permitted.

Rally then, ENGLISHMEN, Rally round the CONSTITUTION! Recollect that these very LIBERAL, RADICAL REFORMERS toast at their orgies the “MAJESTY of the PEOPLE,” and then judge of the sincerity of their affection to the KINGLY MAJESTY which they now pretend to worship. Away with it! Let the country rally round the KING, let it undeceive him, and teach him that REFORM, such as is now offered to him, is neither more nor less than REVOLUTION; and if any man should think this a falsehood or a folly, refer him to the writer of the PEOPLE, WILLIAM COBBETT, and tell them that HE, their prophet and sage, has thus recorded his opinion of RADICAL REFORM.

“All the Revolutionists,” says COBBETT, (vol. vii. p. 32,) “while they are *endeavouring* to excite the people of Great Britain and Ireland to revolt against the Government, profess great fidelity to their country and LOYALTY TO THEIR KING,—they PRETEND to have nothing in view but the good, the honour, the permanent glory of the empire; they propose to AMEND AND NOT TO DESTROY! to MAKE the PEOPLE TRULY HAPPY and his GRACIOUS MAJESTY truly great.”

Of the WHIGS, and Radicals, COBBETT says, “WHIGS and REPUBLICANS, (for they are essentially the same, and only vary their denomination to suit times and circumstances;) are as eager to make proselytes as the worst species of fanatics, and are actuated by a *motive infinitely more base and wicked*;—the object of the WHIG IS TO DESTROY

EVERY THING THAT IS GREAT AND NOBLE, to ERADICATE FROM THE HUMAN HEART EVERY GENEROUS PROPENSITY,—ENVY IS HIS RULING PASSION; he is never at his heart's ease while he sees a greater than himself; and, as he is generally very little, HIS LIFE IS A CONTINUAL WARFARE AGAINST RANK AND AUTHORITY!"

Of such deluding hypocrites, such men of words, such boasters, and such theorists, he adds:—"These pretended patriots, these advocates for liberty, would, if they became masters, become a divan of cruel and savage tyrants; they know nothing of liberty but the name, AND THEY MAKE USE OF THAT NAME MERELY TO HAVE THE POWER OF ABOLISHING THE THING!"

But, lest it may be thought that we are blinded by prejudice, or swayed by interest, let us present the reader with the following admonition from the pen of the same WILLIAM COBBETT, who has already afforded us a true picture of THINGS AS THEY ARE.

"Having," says COBBETT, *the Man of the people*,—"having in America witnessed the fatal effects of REVOLUTION—having seen piety give place to a contempt of religion; plain dealing exchanged for shuffling and fraud, universal confidence for universal suspicion and distrust;—having seen a country, once the seat of peace and good neighbourhood, torn to pieces by faction, plunged by intriguing demagogues into never-ceasing hatred and strife;—having seen the crime of rebellion against monarchy punished by the tormenting, the degrading curse of Republicanism, IT IS WITH THE UTMOST INDIGNATION THAT I FIND MANY OF THOSE WHO HAVE THE PRESS at their command, endeavouring to bring down on my native country the very same specimen of calamity and disgrace."

"Notwithstanding the example of America, and the more dreadful example of France, I find the emissaries of the republican faction still preaching

FANATICISM and INFIDELITY—STILL BAWLING FOR THAT CHANGE WHICH THEY HAVE THE AUDACITY TO CALL REFORM!!!—still exerting all their nefarious ingenuity in sapping the foundations of the Church and the Throne. FOR ME, who have seen acts passed by a republican legislature, more fraudulent than forgery or coining; *for me*, who have seen republican officers of state offering the country for sale for a few thousand dollars; for me, who have seen republican judges become felons, and felons become republican judges; for me to fold my hands, and tamely listen to the *insolent eulogists* of republican governments and rulers, would be a shameful abandonment of principle,—a dastardly desertion of duty.”

These, and a thousand more examples may be quoted, to shew the folly and madness, not to call them by harsher names, of the course which the people are at present taught to adopt: taught, we say, because it has been proved, that until Ministers—*then in opposition*—hit upon the REFORM question to overthrow the DUKE OF WELLINGTON’S GOVERNMENT, which they hoped by that means to do, there were for several years, no PETITIONS TO PARLIAMENT ABOUT REFORM whatever; nobody wanted Reform; nobody cared about it: and now that the petitions *are got up*, what *are they*?—cries raised by the same faction, which espoused QUEEN CAROLINE, and have espoused all other revolutionary cries for the basest of purposes. Should such mock petitions have any effect upon the public mind? We say No. We unite with Mr. PITT, who, upon Lord GREY’S old attack in 1793, made this observation:—“What weight ought to belong to petitions coming to the House, carrying every appearance of concert and system; *combined in the same prayer*, and *expressed nearly in the same language*? THE FRAUD IS TOO GROSS AND PALPABLE, and it is evident from WHAT QUARTER

THEY COME, and WITH WHAT VIEWS THEY ARE PRESENTED."

Be firm, therefore, Englishmen, to the CONSTITUTION; be awake to the falsehoods which the professors of liberality make; be assured, that if the country be true to herself, no injury can accrue to her: awake to a sense of the blessings you enjoy, the danger you are about to encounter; for let faction move the LAND-MARKS OF THE CONSTITUTION, and ANARCHY and CONFUSION and PERPETUAL CHANGE begin. In short, discard all the specious nonsense of the radical orators; look to facts; refer to history; and be assured, coloured as it may be, or disguised as they try to disguise it, the plain fact is — that **THE PROPOSED REFORM IS REVOLUTION**. May the Parliament reject it, and substitute a safe and practicable measure of **AMENDMENT!**





